

Appl. No. 10/719,406
Reply to Action of 1/24/2006
Page 5

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Reconsideration is requested in view of the following remarks. Minor corrections have been made to the specification. Claims 1-4 remain pending in the application.

Claim Rejections – 35 USC §103

Claims 1-4 are rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as unpatentable over Iwata et al. (US 5,481,455) in view of Kin et al. (US 5,493,893). Applicant respectfully traverses this rejection.

Claim 1 requires wheel speed sensors for detecting vibrations from a road surface through tires,....

The rejection mistakenly asserts that Iwata et al. disclose wheel speed sensors 1-4 (See col. 3, lines 1-15) for detecting vibrations from a road surface through tires.... In fact, Iwata et al. only disclose wheel speed sensors for detecting vehicle speed, and nowhere discloses or suggests use of wheel speed sensors for detecting vibrations from a road surface through tires as disclosed and recited in claim 1.

Claim 1 further requires means for calculating a first vehicle speed..., means for calculating a second vehicle speed..., and means for determining that hydroplaning has occurred if a deviation between the first vehicle speed and the second vehicle speed is greater than a certain value.

The rejection mistakenly asserts that Kin et al. discloses means for calculating a first vehicle speed..., and means for calculating a second vehicle speed.... In fact, Kin et al. only disclose use of spectral density signals associated with rotational vibration components for each wheel. Although wheel speed sensors are employed by the invention of Kin et al., these wheel speed sensors are used solely to output the spectral density signals corresponding to rotational vibrations. Nowhere does Kin et al. disclose or suggest means for calculating a first vehicle speed..., and means for calculating a second vehicle speed.... If vehicle speed alone was sufficient to implement the invention of Kin et al., then Kin et al. would not have resorted to the use of a spectral density signal distribution that, according to Kin et al, varies with the vehicle speed (column 2, lines 18-

Appl. No. 10/719,406
Reply to Action of 1/24/2006
Page 6

19) to detect wheel grip on a road. It is not possible to modify Iwata et al. in view of Kin et al. without use of Applicant's specification as a template, to arrive at Applicant's claimed invention. Kin et al. does not remedy the deficiencies of Iwata et al. For at least these reasons, claim 1 is patentable over Iwata et al., alone or in combination with Kin et al. Applicant does not concede the correctness of the rejections.

In view of the above, early issuance of a notice of allowance is solicited. Any questions regarding this communication can be directed to the undersigned attorney, Curtis B. Hamre, Reg. No. 29,165 at (612) 455-3802.



Dated: March 13, 2006

Respectfully submitted,

HAMRE, SCHUMANN, MUELLER &
LARSON, P.C.
P.O. Box 2902-0902
Minneapolis, MN 55402-0902
(612) 455-3800

By: Curtis B. Hamre
Curtis B. Hamre
Reg. No. 29,165
CBH/lad/cmr